DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 123 EA 019 121

AUTHOR Taylor, Barbara O.
TITLE Metasensemaking: How the Effective Elementary Principal Accomplishes School Improvement.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986). For a related paper, see EA 019 122.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Role; Change Strategies; Cognitive Processes; Content Analysis; Cooperative Planning; Decision Making; Educational Change; Elementary Education; Epistemology; Ethnography; Improvement Programs; *Instructional Leadership; Interpersonal Communication; Language Research; Organizational Communication; *Organizational Theories; *Principals; Program Effectiveness; Research Methodology; Role Theory; *School Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *Grounded Theory

ABSTRACT

To illustrate the theoretical dynamics involved in analysis of the process of "metasensing," this paper investigates the language of 22 elementary school principals and their strategic actions during school improvement programs. The study's grounded theory approach frames the principals' "epistemology of practice"--thereby eliciting metasensemaking. The paper reviews organizational theories that employ language indicators. Metasensemaking, which describes motivating procedures and interpersonal negotiations, discloses how organizations change. Assisted by ethnographic methods, this research sought a common "knowledge-in-action" within successful principals' explanatory language about improvement strategies. Discoveries were as follows: (1) effective principals share a knowledge-in-action built upon pragmatic experience; (2) effective principals link classroom actions by planning that is implemented through communication adjusted in units of strategic dialog; and (3) during these dialogs, principals create organizational learning, or metasensemaking, which furthers program momentum. As an intuitive process, metasensemaking employs goal and other frames; a sample unit of strategic dialog between a principal and a teacher illustrates these cognitive frames. Principals choose an appropriate enactment environment for change, epitomized in the "criterion of effectiveness"--the uppermost educational value. The conceptual foundations of metasensemaking contain elements of negotiation that align the school's improvement program components with its constituencies. Twenty-eight references are included. (CJH)

ED278123

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Barbara O. Taylor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

METASENSEMAKING:
HOW THE EFFECTIVE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL ACCOMPLISHES SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Barbara O. Taylor
Northwestern University

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting
The American Educational Research Association
San Francisco April 1986

EA 019 121

Acknowledgements

This paper is the result of conversations and encouragement from many good sources:

B. Claude Mathis helped me to carry out the original research, and to form a structure for reporting the results.

Robert Duncan introduced me to the research procedure of generating grounded theory, Donald Schon's work, and his own work with Jane Dutton, which was the glue of the theory reported here.

David Clark critiqued the research, and gave me the first encouragement to develop the original theory further. He coined the word, "metasensemaking."

William Kritek substantiated the original research, comparing it to what he had found in his role as university liaison to the Milwaukee Public Schools R.I.S.E. Program.

Jill Ker Conway gave help and encouragement when it was most needed by substantiating the original theory as a college administrator, and as a friend and teacher challenged me to finish the work.

Charles Bidwell read the original study, gave criticism which placed the theory in the literature, and so helped me to develop a new language to explain the metasensemaking of the principal.

Daniel Levine gave faith to the concept of metasensemaking, by paying attention to its importance in the strategic planning process of the principal. He pushed the present paper in the direction of general theory by seeing that the barriers and opportunities identified by the principal are generic to schools, and that the strategic frames used by the principal may be applicable to good managers in other organizations who would be leaders in organizational development.

I especially wish to thank the research sample principals for welcoming me into their world. Because of the confidentiality I assured them I cannot mention their names here, nor can I mention the names of the district staffs involved. All of these people showed respect for the project and gave a generous portion of their time and energy. These contibutions were beyond measure and made the project a truly collaborative endeavor.

METASENSEMAKING:
HOW THE EFFECTIVE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL ACCOMPLISHES SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Barbara O. Taylor
Northwestern University

INTRODUCTION

In the last few years many studies have been completed which investigate the language of the actors in organizations, probing the relationships between thought and action, action and organizational accomplishment. (Argyris and Schön, 1974) (Schön, 1983) (Argyris, 1982) (Schein, 1985) (Bennis & Nanus, 1985) Using language as research indicators of action relationships, these organizational theorists and their colleagues of the non-orthodox school of organizational study attempt to connect behavior with decision-making outcomes, describing such relationships as stable subassemblies and double interacts (Weick, 1979), double-looped learning (Argyris and Schön, 1974), strategic issue diagnosis (Dutton and Duncan, 1986), and sensemaking (Strauss, Schatzman, Bucher, Ehrlich, and Sabshin, 1963). Meanings which organizational members give the language of leaders have become the central object of study.

These studies are a reaction to the concept of "bounded rationality" as first proposed by James March and Herbert Simon in 1958. The non-orthodox school has accepted this tenet and has

proceeded to study its rational and non rational components, rejecting Cohen and March's subsequent and entirely Positivist interpretation of bounded rationality, as played out in the garbage can school of organizational theory (Cohen, March and Olsen, 1972) and that of organized anarchy (Cohen and March, 1974). Instead, the non-othodox school has built upon the metaphors indicated, where they are appropriate, and related the organizational properties which were identified because of the metaphorical perspectives. (Weick, 1979)

Following the lead of the non-orthodox school this paper is an attempt to investigate the language of elementary school principals and their strategic actions during school improvement programs. The paper builds on a substantive grounded theory generated in 1984 by the author. The theory delineates the effective principal's "epistomology of practice" (Schön, 1983) which included the discovery of the process of metasensemaking.

The process of metasensemaking is used by the principal to move his or her school along the road to school improvement, and is steeped in many concepts of mutual causality, by which organizations are run. Metasensemaking describes the motivating procedures, attendant structures, fleeting adjustments and negotiations, and controlling influences effective principals use of a day-to-day basis. Indeed metasensemaking may hold a key to understanding the "whys" of organizational change, and if studied well enough may lead the organizational theorists to a grounded general theory of organizations.

The Problem and its Relevance

> There is considerably more data in the literature about strategies used by principals than there is about either goals or factors. The bulk of studies available emphasizes this set of principal behaviors and the factors they are intended to influence or actually do influence. While it seems crucial (both conceptually and practically), the present state of research evidence does not permit the establishment of relationships between factors and strategies. A major complication in the establishment of such links is that single strategies may influence multiple factors. (Leithwood and Montgomery, 1982:325-326)

Since 1982, a number of studies have attempted to establish research evidence for "relationships between factors and strategies." One of the largest, the DESSI study (1982) led to the publication of a book by Huberman and Miles, Innovation up Close, which is an abridged version of the three-year study. The authors begin the comprehensive book with a significant observation:

> The process unwinds in its own terms, mocking standard frameworks, and challenging the researcher to make a coherent summary from the welter of observed and reported events. And even when the story of the implementation process has emerged, there is still another challenge: developing explanations, a reasonable web of causal influences that helps us understand, not just that a school improvement effort worked or failed....but why it did. (page 1)

The "why" of the implementation links has continued to perplex educational researchers. What the principal does and how those actions affect classroom outcomes has continued to be described; why these effects happen has yet to be revealed, in a comprehensive theory. A comprehensive theory would help to inform the implementation problems of school improvement programs throughout the nation. Knowledge gained from this implementation "action research" could be used to form the undergraduate and graduate programs in the field of Educational Administration.

The Research Questions

How do effective principals go about structuring their strategies for school improvement. If a "steady state" (Katz and Kahn, 1978) is necessary for successful adaptation in organizations what is it that the effective principal does to promote this steady state, even as he or she goes about running the school on a day-to-day basis? What are the frames the principal uses, and the important factors he or she addresses in strategic decision-making processes during school improvement programs? What reasons do principals give for these choices?

How do successful principals link their own actions with academic and behaviorial outcomes in the classroom? Do the linkages the principal makes in strategy for school improvement describe a knowledge common to effective principals? If there is a common "knowledge-in-action" here, of what does it consist?

Discussion

In the early 'eighties when educational researchers were delineating the links between principal behaviors and classroom outcomes at the school site, organizational theorists were pleading for more comprehensive perspectives from colleagues. The search for more comprehensive theory in organizational studies has led researchers from many fields to attempt to break from the old paradigm which stemmed from the Positivist traditions which have dominated the field for over fifty years. Organizational studies stemming from the literature of Organizational Behavior, Sociology, Political Science, Economics, and our own Educational Administration are undergoing attempts at radical change. The "neo-orthodox" camp attempts to fence-sit between the classical organizational theorists and such "non-orthodox" types as Karl Weick, who embrace a new arrangement known as the Schwartz and Ogilvy

paradigm. (Clark, 1983) The primary problem these seers must confront is the fact that many of the old paradigms and some of the new, exclude important variables, such as organization's external environment. Also in their attempt to tidy up messy organizational processes researchers draw "black boxes" where organizational dynamics become obscure. While this trick produces models which are more honest in their presentation, these same models lose power as research is translated into practice.

This research environment has led many researchers in the field of Educational Administration to excitement about the role their field might play, and the opportunities they themselves might grasp to move the study of the dynamics of organizations-in-action forward. Indeed, the field of Educational Administration may harbor just the type of organizations the study of which could lead to a general theory of organizations. (Bidwell, 1985) The school site, with its flat organizational structure, has just the type of less contiminated links the organizational theorists are seeking to study in efforts to be both comprehensive and grounded. The industrial models, with their profit motives and long-linked reporting structures do not seem to be able to produce a general theory which would include not-for-profit entities and governmental "street-level bureaucracies." (Lipsky, 1980) The quest for a formal theory of organizations might start in our own back yard.

This paper, then will address the former problem, that of finding explanation for the relationships between the behavior of the principal and classroom outcomes during programs of school improvement. But the exploratory research cited here, which generated a grounded theory which was substantive concerning the strategic thinking and actions of the elementary principal during school improvement programs (Taylor, 1984), can be read in light of the emerging paradigm (non-orthodox school of organizational theory).

The organizational adjustments which take place during the implementation of improvement programs are 1) complex, 2) heterarchic, 3) holographic, 4) indeterminate, 5) of mutual causality, 6) morphogenic, and 7) perspectival. These are the characteristics David Clark (1983) and others attribute to the "new" (Schwartz and Ogilvy) paradigm.

The links between principal behavior and classroom outcomes can be found in the guise of an "epistomology of practice" (Schon, 1983) used by effective principals as they plan and act strategically to achieve beneficial and lasting school change. The implicit theories used by effective principals reflect the new paradigm. The discovery of the pragmatic knowledge base owned by these principals may lead to an organizational theory, finally comprehensive and grounded, which can explain and predict behaviors of members of organizations-in-action.

This paper proceeds from the discovery of the effective principal's implicit theories, indicated by the language he or she uses to explain strategic actions during school change (Taylor, 1984), and builds on that theory with regard to the process which brings all of the implementation activities into focus: metasensemaking by the principal during episodes of strategic dialogue.

The configurations of metasensemaking, the frames the principal uses to bound the strategic dialogue, the process itself and the "whys" of the sequence of emphases used are all important to the discussion here.

The relevance of the pragmatic knowledge base of metasensemaking to the undergraduate and graduate studies of students in the field of Educational Administration will be tested and developed by researchers who see that relevance. The cognitive ethnography of the principal's strategic plans may inform the organizational theorists, who see here a fertile source for explana-

tion and prediction of behavior in organizations.

Research Methodology: Rationale

Exploratory research is needed to discover the strategic links between principal behaviors and classroom activities. The perspectives of two different fields seemed to inform this problem: Organization Behavior, and policy implementation (Political Science). Both fields are interested in the relationship between policy development, the motivation of workers, organizational learning and organizational response. Both disciplines harbor diagnostic models for delineating organizational systems and their effect upon organizational members.

From the literature of policy implementation, Michael Lipsky's book The Street-Level Bureaucrat (1980), was especially elucidating in depicting the central dilemma of bureaucracies which deal with individual client cases:

> In street-level bureaucracies there is an irreducible requirement that public employees interact with citizens to determine the nature and extent of public services they should receive and to provide these services through interactions with them. If this is the case we are challenged to obtain accountability when bureaucratic mechanisms are inadequate and inappropriate. (1980:201)

Lipsky felt the conflict between bureaucratic demand for uniform dispensation of services and the client's need for individual attention tested the ingenuity of the street-level bureaucrat. How well this conflict was resolved decided how well the agency did its job, and the "accountability" for such actions was almost impossible, if unique cases were to be decided and served equitably and efficaciously. The street-level bureaucrat herself needed some room to play out the service delivered, in terms of the client's special case. Control of standards came through professional procedures, and not through bureaucratic rules.

This theory seemed appropriate to elementary school principals and teachers, street-level bureaucrats that they are. If there is a need in schools

for dispensation of unique cases, and certainly each child is unique in that he learns at different rates, with different styles, and is motivated in various ways compared with his classmates, then the study of how this dispensation occurs, how it is controlled in order to meet standards, how it is evaluated, and how decisions are made regarding this dispensation is of interest in studying the school improvement process. If there are "professional procedures" present in the regulation of day-to-day activities in the school, how are these related to similar controlling and coordination activities during school improvement programs?

The study of these procedures might provide the missing links which would connect what the principal did daily at the school site, how he or she strategized about school improvement, and how he communicated with school personnel, to classroom activities, especially pupil pursuits. (Harnishfeger and Wiley 1981) The principal's implicit theories, upon which he builds strategies and chooses actions, might become evident with this study. The practices of the field of education might inform the academic theory.

We could work backward from the observation of the environment of the "effective classroom," and see what led to what in the building of an effective school, filled with such classrooms. Investigation of particular mechanisms and organizational structures used by principals in effective schools might show the research community how the practitioners move the school along in improvement programs, against the almost insurmountable barriers of isolated classrooms, demand for bureaucratic procedures, curriculm taught in fragmented units, and the need to answer to several constituencies.

To study the relationship between the "principal's strategies and those factors that are intended to influence, or actually do influence," it would be necessary to study the principal's language first hand. It would be nec-

essary to devise a research methodology to process the principal's words and phrases and develop the context from his perspective rather than the perspective of the investigator.

An ethnographic approach was deemed appropriate to gather the primary data. Day long visits to the school being investigated, conversations with personnel encountered when possible, and observations of common areas, classrooms, and classes would be necessary.

Above all the principal would be observed in his school, as he made decisions during the day, as he encountered the routine and more unique problems which made up his daily round of tasks. The research form of "shadowing," rather than the more passive form of participant-observer was used. If the investigator wished to become familiar with the principal's world, from the principal's perspective, then she needed to ask "why" as she observed the principal's actions, in order to make connections between action and thought. It was hoped that by using this procedure the investigator would provoke from the principal more explicit delineation of the decision-making process and the knowledge upon which it was based. Intervention at specific points of action would alter the course of action in some instances; however, the investigator would be privy to spontaneous thoughts, often fleeting in nature and like a phrase of music, not to be repeated again in exactly the same form, because of contextual considerations.

By shadowing the principal, the investigator could gather his representations, make line sketches of the symbols he was attempting to paint, reflect upon his reflections, and finally prefigure the frames the principal was using to address problems. In the structured interview which followed the shadowing of the principal, the investigator could check to see if the

frames she sketched were close in configuration to the ones the principal actually used as he recounted reasons for decisions made, actions taken, months or years before, or even today.

Cross-checks to the investigator's interpretation of the principal's actions and his units of strategic dialogue came from school records and archival data, school communications, and from conversations with school personnel.

The choice of a research sample was straightforward in the preliminary stage of research. Model schools from three "lighthouse districts" were chosen in order for the investigator to become familiar with the configurations already existing in effective schools. These schools were deemed "effective" because average standardized scores on achievement tests placed students from these districts in a range of 1.6 to 2.1 levels over national norms. Programs in the arts and daily physical education activities were common. Resources in these schools were adequate. Parents and citizens were satisfied with these schools.

The choice of a district and schools to be investigated in the final stage of research was more complicated. The investigator wished to find a group of schools already in the process of school improvement, directed by the school district but with authority for implementation decisions delegated to the schools. The district must have a research and evaluation department and good longitudinal data. The final requirement, that extra resources assigned to the school improvement program be kept to a minimum, was crucial. The investigator wished to see what configurations developed in schools where school improvement was a function of using what was already there in terms of resources. Extra resources for all schools in the United States who wished to improve was not a political reality in

1984. It was also hypothesized that extra resources might cause goal displacement in schools; that is, schools wanting more money for programs might use added resources on programs without changing the school culture, climate or procedures.

The criterion of "effectiveness" was especially troublesome. How could schools be classified as "effective" which were only in the middle of school improvement programs? It was at this juncture that the investigator remembered something from the Effective Schools literature that would be of help. Ronald Edmonds had insisted that to him an effective school was one that "eliminates the relationship between successful performance and family background of the individual student." He had used this summary definition of school effectiveness in his project, "Search for Effective Schools." (1978) While this choice of definition of an effective school remains controversial, and Edmonds himself says it was politically motivated as well as theoretically motivated, it served the purpose of exploratory research.

The logic is simple. If, in schools which "eliminate the relationship between successful performance and family background," there is a configuration of beliefs and organizational structures, a culture, a climate which promotes an effective school, then this configuration should be studied. The goal of educating all of the children cannot be considered unimportant in a democratic society, and so this particular criterion of effectiveness can be accepted by many constituencies in our pluralistic society; it is not an arbitrary choice. Schools investigated in the final stage of research would meet this criterion, based upon school-by-school outcomes on standardized student achievement tests.

To measure which schools were effective under this definition, student scores on standardized achievement tests in reading and mathematics would be

"disaggregated," according to socio-economic status of the child. The SES would be measured by two measures: if the child were part of the free lunch program, and/or if the child's mother were not a high school graduate, then that child would be placed in the "low-socio-economic" or "low income" category (depending upon how the school district described these classifications.)

In order for a school to be defined as "effective," the normal distribution curves of low income children would be very similar or equal to the distribution curves of middle income children at that school. Furthermore, the schools would still be improving, even if some components of the improvement program had begun to plateau. All levels of the school would be improving, if not every year, at least every other year. An upward trend would be unmistakable across all classrooms.

Principals of these schools deemed effective would themselves be defined as effective principals, as long as they had been participants as principals in the improvement program for more than four years. Four years is sufficient time to bring students to the base line norm of effectiveness as defined above; four years is also enough time for slippage to occur under the direction of a more typical principal. All of the schools and principals in the final research sample met these standards.

Methodology: Research Procedure

Twenty-two principals from five school districts were interviewed and shadowed by the investigator, who spent a day at each school. Arriving at school before the principal did, the investigator observed the arrival of students, teachers, and staff. Each visit was unique in the investigative procedure, because each school was assumed to be unique. During the final research stage, however, certain common research instruments were used at

each school (eight in all) of the sample. These instruments were:

- Classroom observation check list
- Shadowing check list
- Structured interview with open-ended questions
- The principal's role instrument

All interviews were taped and the tapes transcribed by the investigator. The interviews were one and one-half to two hours in length, and served as a check to see if the frames the investigator sketched during the shadowing of the principal were close in configuration to the ones the principal actually used as he or she recounted the reasons for decisions made, actions taken that day, or months or even years before.

Using data collection and interpretation procedures specified by Glaser and Strauss in constant comparison analysis (1967) and by Holsti in content analysis (1969), the language of the principals was transformed as indicators into theoretical categories and properties. Extensive coding was used to make systematic the comparisons.

These interpretive processes produced a discernible pattern in the principal's strategic thinking during school improvement activities. By focusing on certain events in the daily life of the school and giving them special interpretation, the principal motivates staff and students, and achieves the organizational momentum necessary to carry out improvement programs.

The discernible pattern became evident to the investigator as she formed a laundry list of the improvement programs' benchmarks, as recalled by the sample principals during interviews and shadowing activities. The research indicators, the language of the principals, were grouped into many school activity categories and finally collapsed into four major groups. These

groups became the theoretical categories (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) from which the theory evolved. The four groups contain all the significant strategic thinking of the principals. These groups are the four primary managerial relationships the sample principals use in their work. They bound their strategic thinking with these four frames.

As these theoretical categories were being discovered, the investigator noticed a difference in the strategic thinking of two of the principals in the final phase of research. Rather than address strategic issues on idiographic, formal or structural and external levels of the organization, these principals seemed to be concerned about only one level. Further content analysis led to classify these two principals as more typical types. (see section on "Discoveries") When school-by-school test results were released by the district, indeed these two schools had made less progress, and had "plateaued" in some areas of improvement, compared with others in the sample. The investigator knew at that point that the method of generating grounded theory were turning up interesting relationships. Even a small sample had led to saturation of the conceptual categories.

In generating grounded theory, a representative sample is not as important as it is in testing a theory. Glaser and Strauss tell us that it is more important that the theory be built on a foundation that is appropriate to the terms or language in which it is expressed. It is more important to saturate the theoretical categories with rich description of the elements involved and to propose their relationships where they are evident.

The research process itself evolves through the inductive method of reasoning during the generation of grounded theory. The primary data base must come from empirical research, field work, and observable events or inter-

views. Each discovery can lead to another path of inquiry. The researcher is not bound to a predetermined path, as she is with deductive forms of inquiry.

Of course, inferences must be plausible, and the context of a finding alters its meaning. These demands led the investigator to do all of the data collection, interpretation and manipulation herself. While this procedure may have biased the results of the study, it insured that the core of the emerging theory remained open to suggestion and subsequent alteration when and where it seemed necessary.

For instance, the emergence of the research unit of analysis in this study is a good example of how the core of the theory changed.

At first it seemed that the process of strategic issue resolution would be the unit of analysis. What were the identifiable strategic issues? How did the principal respond to these issues? With whom did he or she interact and what were the observable results? Jane Dutton had traced what she termed the strategic issue resolution process (SIR process) in her 1983 study of nine such processes in an industrial organization. (see section on "Discoveries") Using Dutton's model the investigator realized during the last four visits to schools during the final research phase, that the unit of analysis should be a single episode of the process, which she named a unit of "strategic dialogue."

The inductive reasoning which elected to use the unit of strategic dialogue as the unit of analysis went something like this: Unlike most large industrial concerns a school is a very flat organization with hierarchies according to clusters (horizontal) rather than height (vertical), as James

Thompson described hierarchies typical of organizations containing interdependent groups with high needs for coordination and conflict resolution. (1967) In this sense the school leader, the principal, is a source of much of the coordination and control mechanisms. There is not a long line of command present to interfere with the influence the principal can exert. The effective principal is aware of this aspect of discretionary decision-making accorded him, and, taking advantage of district "loose-coupling", uses individual communication episodes to promote conditions which help to further school improvement.

We have here a largely uncontaminated source of motivation, of organization momentum, to study. By listening to the principal's language, we could map out a cognitive ethnography of the principal's mind. By observing these individual communication episodes, and then asking the principal later what it was he or she wished to accomplish in each episode, we could name the frames and factors the principal used to define the dialogue. Could it be that these frames and factors described were the links between the behavior of the principal and those "factors he or she intended to influence or actually did influence" during school improvement programs?

The process of generating grounded theory once again allowed the investigator to see what needed to be seen. If there were common patterns of strategic thought among this sample of diverse principals (their only common trait was that they were deemed successful and effective), then we could infer that there was indeed a common knowledge base being used to bring about the improvement of schools. This knowledge base, whether it stemmed from pragmatic sources or more academic ones, if it were known, could be of use in teaching other principals how to bring good schools into being.

The research process as devised and interpreted by the investigator pointed the way. The investigator followed. Generating grounded theory is the epitome of what Barbara McClintock, research scientist of first rank, called for when she said,

> One must have the time to look, the patience to hear what the material has to say to you, the openness to let it come to you. Above all, one must have a feeling for the organism.

Discoveries: The Principal's Metasensemaking: Interaction with Staff, Parents and Students

The important discoveries of this research were grouped in three clusters:

1) Effective principals own certain primary skills and knowledge; they share a "knowledge-in-action" (Schon, 1983) built upon a pragmatic knowledge base which they have discovered through on-the-job experiences.

   Part of this knowledge-in-action are four managerial frames or relationships, with which the effective principal bounds his or her strategic actions.

2) The effective principal links his or her actions to the classroom through strategic planning. This planning is implemented largely through strategic communication, and is adjusted on-the-spot in units of strategic dialogue, which was the research unit of analysis in this study.

3) During these units of strategic dialogue, the principal carries out a form of organizational learning called metasensemaking. Metasensemaking is a form of organizational enactment (Weick, 1979) used to further the potential for organizational momentum and individual motivation during programs of school improvement. (Dutton and Duncan, 1986)

   During strategic dialogue, the effective principal attends to certain factors, emphasizing different elements in these factors, during the successive stages or phases of school change: Principals emphasize cultural and climate elements of the school

> during the first change phase; elements which promote consistency across school procedures during the second phase; and in the third phase of school improvement, effective principals promote cohesion as they institutionalize the changes that work for the school.

While all the above discoveries are important to forming the theory generated in the exploratory research carried out (Taylor, 1984), this paper will address the discovery of "metasensemaking" and show its importance in the bringing about of beneficial and lasting change in the school. Metasensemaking holds the explanatory components of the theory, and is of most interest to those who would form a general theory of organizations.

What is Metasensemaking?

Metasensemaking is an intuitive process, which involves give and take between participants. It is first and foremost a dialogue. It is "sensemaking" because the dialogue is a mechanism for organizational learning, the motivating of organizational members during periods of major change, and for forming conditions which can lead to increasing organizational momentum. It is "meta" because it is slightly above and beyond "sensemaking" itself, and because the process transforms meanings in the organizational culture and structures; new organizational arrangements seem to require new metaphors, and new metaphors attract new attitudes in each participant's mind. Whether these new attitudes are turned into new behaviors and acts by the member so involved is not determined, but the chances for new acts are increased, probabilities for change are increased. (Dutton and Duncan, 1986)

Metasensemaking is an activity theory, based upon an earlier grounded and substantive theory which described the strategic thinking of the school site principal during improvement programs in public elementary schools. (Taylor, 1984) In a sense, this paper is ahead of the literature, because

it is an attempt to take many theoretical elements from the literature and make connections between them, connections which explain motivations and linkages during organizational change. Many of the theoretical linkages are substantiated in the literature, but the pragmatic linkages, both intellectual and strategic, are new. These pragmatic relationships were discovered by practitioners and acted upon by them.

This is the story, then, on how effective elementary school principals design their schools and implement their strategies in order to improve their schools. It is a cognitive ethnography of their world of thought. The cartography of their mental maps was done by the investigator. The content and substance of their strategic world is theirs. The theories of human behavior and strategic action which exist in the literature are only slightly known by these principals, and are largely psychological in their bases. They have come to know their thoughts by virtue of successful action built on strategies that express their "knowledge-in-action." Theirs is a knowing-in-action, to which they apply reflection-in-action. (All of these terms are Donald Schön's) On three levels of organization - the idiographic, structural, and external or environmental - and among all of their constituencies, successful principals respond to a world of give and take in the most complex form imaginable - they are metasensemaking.

Sensemaking is carried on continuously by people, inside and outside organizations. We are interested in the sensemaking which occurs within organizations, especially schools. Each member of the organization engages in this process, which may be consciously or subconsciously purposeful, many times everyday.

> Ultimately, as individuals work together, they must arrive at some mutually acceptable consensus about the meaning of the organization: they must arrive at a group cause map. The sensemaking processes engaged in by individuals,

> by groups of individuals, and by groups of groups are continuous and constantly changing as their experience of the organization changes.
>
> Developing a group sense of the organization requires negotiation. It demands a meeting of the minds and a willingness to reconsider one's own cause maps in the light of other's, and in the context of new situations. This process may result in slight alternations or major shifts in understandings of the organization, yielding new cause maps all around. These collaborative understandings constitute the negotiated order, the currently agreed-upon sense of the organization, which is constantly emerging. These emerging understandings, in turn, act on participants, affecting their experience of the organization and hence their future sensemaking.

Enactment is the first stage of sensemaking. "Enactment is that process by which the environment is created for the organization. This created environment is what decision-makes then react to in formulating and revising the strategy and design of the organization and in evaluating the organization's performance." After enactment occurs, in one person's mind or in three or nine, about what constitutes "our situation here," the dyad or group can then set about sensemaking between one another. (Weick, 1979)

Principals, effective and less effective alike, spend a large portion of their time in dialogue with individuals and groups at the school site. Whether accomplishing daily tasks or moving the school along toward improvement goals, or juggling both objectives simultaneously, the principal participates in these communication episodes, and uses them as his or her primary vehicle to accomplish strategic objectives.

We call these communication episodes "units of strategic dialogue," and these were our units of analysis. Most of the discoveries attributed to this research were elements of the unit of strategic dialogue: the frames with which the principal bounded the dialogue; the verbal give and take and the emphasis the principal gave these dialogues during

the successive phases of change in the school; the knowledge base upon which the strategy was based; the "knowledge-in-action" used by effective change principals. Focussing on both processes and content of the units of strategic dialogue, this research found as did Jane Dutton, that, "the processing of strategic issues has several different meanings in the organization. The strategic issue resolution process was found to be a performance program, control process, channel for learning, ventilator for participants, agenda setting process and attention organzing process. Each of these meanings highlighted a different but significant dimention of the process".

In a word this strategic process, used by principals, teachers, students, and the district office, in cooperation with parents and the community, to move the school along the improvement path can be termed "metasensemaking." The process is iterative and dynamic, and so must receive impetus from a person or group to move it along. The process cries for a designer to give it thrust and focus by coordinating and controlling the emerging pattern, to make certain what is being done is what the school wants to produce as its product.

The Role of the Effective Principal in Metasensemaking

The effective principal is first and foremost a designer of organizational arrangements that will help a school develop a capacity for change. The principal's roles as manager/administrator, instructional leader, and developer of staff all are functions of the role of designer. Indeed the successful principal uses all of these secondary roles to carry out his or her design activities.

The art of organizational design takes those components of strategy, structure, incentives and rewards, decision support systems, human re-

sources, and organizational culture, which the organization owns, and manipulates them to promote organizational learning and momentum for change. (Dutton and Duncan, 1986) The primary mechanism used by the principal to carry out these manipulations is metasensemaking.

A sample principal very aware of his need to design a "school that is workable" from the beginning of his tenure said:

> I knew there were two troubled schools that I might be sent to. So when I came here I felt they sent me to do a job. I'm getting paid to do it and I'll do it my way. I don't believe in a whole lot of participatory decision-making initially. I think that comes after you set the tone and put the basic structure in place where change can take place for the better. Someone has to be the designer, the architect, to come up with that design that's going to make things workable.

This principal tells us he knows what he is doing. He disagrees with much of the Educational Administration literature which says that participatory governance is advisable from the beginning during school improvement programs. (Joyce, Hersh, and McKibbin, 1983) (Marburger, 1985) He feels that in schools that are "troubled" certain broad strokes must come first to settle the school. He calls this design, a design that is "workable." He intends to alter cultural, structural, and human resource components initially in his plan of improvement.

Immediately, with only one paragraph, the language of the principal tells us many things about the way he thinks strategically. First, there is a pre-hoc, post-hoc frame, much the same references that policy analysts and program planners use. There is a vision of what a good school looks like, and the steps that need to be taken to make this school come into being. Second, there is an interweaving of thoughts "how" and thoughts "that," which includes thoughts "why." Gilbert Ryle describes this type of pragmatic thinking succinctly:

> What distinguishes sensible from silly operations is not their parentage but their procedure, and this holds no less for practical performances. "Intelligent" cannot be defined in terms of "intellectual" or knowing "how" in terms of "knowing that"; "thinking what I am doing" does not connote "both thinking what to do and doing it." When I do something intelligently..... I am doing one thing and not two. My performance has a special procedure or manner, not special antecedents. (quoted in Schön, 1983:51)

The design of good organizational arrangements demands this type of thinking. Educational researchers, studying this cognitive procedure, may need to devise a content construct and a process construct in order to describe adequately this knowing-in-action and reflection-in-action, but in practice they are part of the same procedure, inextricably intertwined. During the research procedure which produced the grounded theory in which metasensemaking was discovered (Taylor, 1984), the devising of these two constructs led to the formation of a matrix (Exhibit 1) of procedure and factors addressed during successive phases of school improvement. This matrix has been substantiated by the sample principals and their supervisors, and has been useful to other practitioners who would build effective schools.

If we study the matrix we will see one phase's activities blend into the next; there are no vertical lines to separate the factors noted. The cognitive structure is not linear,but looks like a Rubic cube, where the sides of the cube are the "rules of thumb," colored differently, ready to be moved around to solve the puzzle. In the school organization, the small cubes are the individuals who make the difference to the improvement program's success. Just as in solving the Rubic cube puzzle, the primary strategy is to align the colors of the individual cubes through certain procedures.

The principal sees the Rubic cube configuration in his or her mind's eye. In order to translate the organizational arrangements into opera-

tions, the effective principal uses strategic planning procedures. Many of the strategic moves are intuitive; they proceed from years of experience, on-the-job learning.

The "rules of thumb" the principal uses form the pattern of action. The rules are devised from certain tenets which describe the effective school in the mind of the principal. For instance, in the Effective Schools research, these tenets are the correlates of effective schools. These are the descriptive goals that are to be achieved if a school climate is to be produced that is conducive to learning and teaching by all children and teachers. The overriding belief, "All kids can learn," or "All kids will learn", produces these correlates, and from them the principal designs organizational arrangements to produce a school where all kids do learn.

As they strategize, successful principals bound their problems into four major managerial and strategic frames, which are generic to school change:

1) the use of a criterion of effectiveness to achieve school improvement and momentum;

2) the working relationship between principal-teachers-students-parents;

3) the setting of professional standards, school standards, behaviorial standards:

4) the establishment and enforcement of an equitable discipline code.

These four frames serve to bound the instrumentalities which translate strategic plans into strategic actions. The principal then designs strategic dialogues to carry out these actions; these dialogues can be with specific and targeted individuals or groups, or for more general

conversation in the school. Whether the strategy flows from School Improvement goals or Effective School research goals, the four strategic forms serve to operationalize the principal's strategic thinking through metasensemaking and other organizational mechanisms.

With this theoretical explanation of how the program elements come together in the principal's mind, we will now look at a conversation between a sample principal and a teacher, a unit of strategic dialogue. We will analyze what happens using the cognitive procedures and mental maps described above.

Principal: Agnes, good morning!

Agnes (a teacher): Hello, Mr. Smith (a fictitious name).

P: Could I talk to you a moment about your pupil Joseph?

A: Certainly. Come into the classroom. (They walk into an empty classroom.)

P: I see by the criterion reference tests that our friend Joseph is having some trouble with fractions.

A: He's just a slow learner. All kids have trouble with fractions.

P: What have you tried with him?

A: The same old sixes and sevens.

P: How do you account for his lag in learning?

A: He's just a slow learner.

P: What do you mean?

A: Well, you know, he's not focusing on the lesson.

P: Have you worked with him?

A: He's in the slower group. I work with all of them.

P: Do you have any idea what his special problem is? He's way below the class norm. If I recall he got into this same situation at the first of the year in math. What worked then?

A: I gave him some extra homework and he and his daddy worked on that at home.

P: Would that work now?

A: Daddy's left home. Mother isn't the type.

P: So what will you do?

A: I don't know. Let me think about it. I'll get back to you.

P: (Taking out his appointment book) Let's make an appointment for this Friday. If there's anyone else in your class I've missed, let's discuss that too. You're doing a good job and I know you can teach these kids. That's why they were assigned to your class to begin with, right?

A: Right, O.,. I'll see you Friday.

P: I can count on you.

Here we see a number of frames being used by the principal during this unit of strategic dialogue:

A goal frame: "All kids can learn."

A working relationship frame: "We'll work this out together, and soon."

A standards frame: "We're going to work to raise this kid's math skills level so that he's closer to class norms."

A discipline frame: "The student knows what's expected of him. His dad isn't around anymore to help him. Maybe that's a let down. Let's find out and help him out of his slump."

The strategy is implicit. The principal has noticed a performance discrepancy of a student in a class of a good teacher. He has confidence in her, so knows he must probably just make her focus on the problem to get results. (She has obviously put off dealing with the problem for some reason.) In the Friday conference he will deal with any problems of uncertainty (support, help with pedagogy, time, materials, curriculum adjustment) she has and move her on the way to help Joseph with his mathematics.

This unit of strategic dialogue reflects knowledge in a number of areas in the field of educational administration, most of which have not been taught to administrators in Schools of Education until very recently. (Barth, 1983):

Curriculum planning and implementation

Child development and family relationships

Teacher supervision

Staff development

Resource management

Time management and administration (principal has time for quickly scheduled teacher conference in a busy schedule; he has set priorities for use of his time)

This is a list of more formal subjects, whether taught or not taught in Schools of Education. The principal has also learned, through internships or as an assistant principal, or as a teacher with administrative responsibilities, a number of procedures which are just as important to management of the school:

Gamesmanship

Leadership skills

Political skills

Giving ownership to colleagues for their ideas for improvement

These learned subjects are also evidenced in this unit of strategic dialogue.

The unit of strategic dialogue allows the principal to gain knowledge of the dimensions of the problem. He finds out just what the teacher's attitude towards the problem consists of, where the student's performance has fallen down, how the teacher plans to rectify the situation (Does she have sufficient knowledge to handle this problem?), if school resources can help. If any answers to these questions are uncertain,

then he must probe further, or "put it on the back burner for awhile." The principal's tacit knowledge gave him the intuitive skill to give a little, take a little, process what is learned and move forward, all in the same conversation. He is acting very much like a good jazz musician:

> As the musicians feel the direction of the music that is developing out of their interwoven contributions, they make sense of it and adjust their performance to the new sense they have made. (Schon, 1983:55)

As one of the principals told the investigator when she asked him to link his new academic program to the fact that his main change goal was to "tighten up on the school discipline code," and asked him how this connected with helping kids to learn, to achieve:

> I don't know how to describe it. It is a visceral thing. Discipline is necessary, communication is necessary, the kids have to know what is expected of them. I think learning will be better in this kind of environment. I believe you must communicate your expectations to students and teachers always, and show by what you say and in your actions what your priorities are. You have to do what you think's necessary to make your own school work, and do what you think is right.
>
> Ultimately, you have to have a forthright, honest feeling with the staff. They are the ones that make or break the school. I can only give a little bit of direction, be consistent with them in my evaluation and support with the kids. Hopefully this will result in a better school.

This particular principal was a sensible, no-nonsense man, who read the research papers circulated by the superintendent, but was fiercely independent about forming his own theory and conclusions from practice. Although his teachers felt he was a bit earnest, they respected him and agreed the discipline code needed more consistent and equitable enforcement. His methods of communication had been successful in forming a working relationship to make the school a better place for learning and working. Judging from the intellectual links he had made to us, the

the principal also communicated to the staff and students how a better school would come about:

> A safe and orderly school, where academic and behavioral expectations are clearly communicated to staff and students, and consistently monitored, is necessary for the staff to carry out its primary responsibility: the design and implementation of an effective teaching-learning process for each and every child. (Individualized instruction was the goal of this district.)

We are observing at the school site level, in schools where improvement programs are thriving, an ongoing trial and error, experimental program, brought to bear by the principal and staff on the academic and behavioral pursuits of the students. "If this, then this" is the scientific format being used by the people involved, which, if they are professionally competent will be rigorous and responsible in its procedure, as well as systematic.

In the two districts studied comprehensively, one urban and low-income, one suburban and middle income, a planning, trial and error, implementation, and evaluation school improvement cycle was ongoing, and was directed by the principals themselves with help from the district Research and Evaluation component and local university faculty. This cycle was not linear, but very iterative at every step: planning and trial and error had interplay, then implementation and adjustment, and finally, when the process had been perceived by those involved to be effective, an evaluation was done, usually of the pre- and post-testing mode, to see if the results substantiated the perceived effectiveness.

The final discovery, then, was a kind of action research in the schools which had committed to school improvement. Although informed by academic sources in universities, the state of the art was achieved by the practitioners themselves, using their own artifacts and language, cognitive structures, and research design.

The Role of the Criterion of Effectiveness

If we assume that "effectiveness" is an intervening variable, and that the organization's dominant coalition, in this case the school site principal working within district policy guidelines, sets the criterion of effectiveness in organizations (Thompson, 1967) then that criterion is the single most important element in the "enactment" process. Enactment is the process by which organizers select, arrange, and retain phenomena in the organizational environment in order to create a more bounded descriptive environment for use in organizational decision-making. It is this environment which March and Simon described when they used the term "bounded rationality" (1958:136-71) It is this created environment that decision-makers react to in formulating and revising the strategy and design of the organization, and in evaluating the organization's performance.

It is within the enactment framework that sensemaking takes place. It is axiomatic to the theory that those wishing to change behavior within the organization must first decide whether that change is able to be brought about within the present organizational enactment arrangement or culture. This decision demands great managerial and leadership judgment, and the correct judgment can save the organization large costs, in terms of the important resources of time, money and personnel reputations. The judgment needed to initiate structures is one of the most precious of leadership skills. Failure to choose the appropriate enactment environment needed for organizational change at the beginning of the school improvement program, for instance, will necessitate beginning "all over again" when change does not come about or if unintended consequences of

change result. The schools of the less effective principals in the sample experienced this need, and the more typical principals heading these schools found their leadership legitimacy challenged on the second try.

The enactment environment is epitomized in the Criterion of Effectiveness.

The criterion of effectiveness is the value from his or her beliefs about how education works, or educational philosophy, which the principal puts uppermost in his or her hierarchy of values. Using this criterion the principal places other values he or she holds in rank order, and from this hierarchy forms a rationale about why he does what he does; why and what he plans, why and when he evaluates, enforces behavior codes, what standards he or she sets for academic performance and student and staff behavior, all proceed from the criterion of effectiveness.

In the schools studied, such phrases as ....

> All kids can learn.
>
> We will teach our kids to work independently from grade one so they will learn to teach themselves.
>
> We teach our kids to learn by doing. Sure they learn the basic skills, but they also learn to apply those skills where they need to.

....describe the criterion of effectiveness. This criterion states the rationale of why we are doing things the way we are. As Nanus and Bennis propose in their book Leaders, "The distinctive role of leadership (in a volatile environment especially) is the quest for "know-why" ahead of "know-how." (1985:40)

The know-why allows missions, goals, and objectives to be stated in a way that they can be aligned and prioritized, and so progress can be

evaluated. In the Effective Schools research, for instance, "all kids can learn", the criterion of effectiveness, allows the use of standardized test scores and their interpretation to target children and units in the curriculum for special attention by the curriculum alignment and curriculum development systems in the school. The standardized tests are never used as absolute indicators, but as indicators which show where to look for solutions to discrepancies noted the improvement program's progress. With these suspicious areas noted by the monitoring system, the principal or other staff responsible can then proceed to plan compensatory actions. The criterion of effectiveness has in this manner created a control system which is not just a unit of the system, but a function of the entire system. In an open system this integration is demanded, in order to produce a steady state of the organization. (Weick, 1979) (Bidwell, 1985)

If we look at the matrix in Exhibit I, we see the criterion of effectiveness placed in the upper left hand corner of the matrix. The matrix is composed of <u>factors</u> and the <u>emphases</u> effective principals place upon the elements of these factors as the sequence of change unfolds. The criterion of effectiveness determines the factors addressed, and so is at the top of the matrix. Emphases in the elements of the factors addressed emanate from the phase of the change process involved (Phase I, II, III, over the top of the matrix); <u>and</u> from the development of the components of the criterion of effectiveness across operations, or functions, of the school site (curriculum development, staff development, etc.); <u>and</u> across the four strategic frames or managerial relationships (listed down the left hand margin of the matrix).

The decision-axis of strategic thinking during the progression of the school improvement program goes from the upper left of the matrix to the lower right; it is upon the factors found under this imaginary line that the most primary strategic decisions are made by the principal and his or her colleagues, in each successive phase of the program.

For instance, if we look at Phase II of the program, we see that cultural considerations of the school are being translated into climate variables, and that the school is becoming safe and orderly, a pleasant place for work. The most primary considerations for the principal and his or her staff at this juncture are strategic decisions regarding inter-staff communication, staff re-assignment, student re-assignment, and the important buffering actions which will help to assure that the school can begin to form its own culture and way of doing things. Most important, trust relationships are being established, and needed resources (time, scheduling, discretionary monies, support staff) obtained. To keep the criterion of effectiveness in focus, recognition for good work by staff, students and the school as a whole is paramount. "This is what we are about, what is important that we do here," is the rallying call.

As Phase II is carried out, variables concerning consistency will be uppermost in the strategic planning of the principal and staff. Inservice training and implementation procedures regarding instructional techniques, pacing, and good classroom management will be the order of the day. The curriculum development process is becoming operational. Curriculum alignment is proceding, and the process is being used and beginning to be understood by all involved.

The metasensemaking of the principal is truly three dimensional and many faceted. Only the human mind could cope with such complexity during on-the-spot conversations, within the framework of the units of strategic dialogue.

Summary

The exploratory study of elementary school principals-in-action has led to the discovery of how and why they plan certain strategic actions during school improvement programs. Meanings the effective principals attach to such words as "high expectations," "monitoring and evaluation," "vision," and "participation," become clearer in the context of the process these principals use to develop good schools: metasensemaking. The dynamics of organizational development which principals live with everyday are delineated in part, using content analysis and constant comparison analysis,and models from recent studies of the nature of organizations. The "fundatmental structure of professional inquiry," is becoming known, and could point the way to a research genre which could itself lead to a comprehensive, grounded formal or general theory of organizations-in-action. This type of professional inquiry is described by Donald Schön:

> ...in each case the practitioner gives an artistic performance. He responds to the complexity, which confuses the student [novice], in what seems like a simple, spontaneous way. His artistry is evident in his selective management of large amounts of information, his ability to spin out long lines of invention and inference, and his capacity to hold several ways of looking at things at once without disrupting the flow of inquiry. (1983:130)

It is true that effective principals are administrators, instructional leaders, managers. But at the core they are designers of organizations that work, and so integrate all of these corporate designations into their mastery. The meanings effective principals communicate during metasensemaking convey metaphors which motivate and inspire members to appropriate actions, and then sustain these actions. The study of this pragmatic process with its give and take between the people involved can reveal how principals reduce uncertainty during times of change, how they persuade schoolpeople and parents of the students and the students themselves of the benefits of the new program. The conceptual foundations upon which metasensemaking is based contain the elements of negotiation which serve to align all of the program components with the school's constituencies in the school improvement process.

The criterion of effectiveness assures that this alignment can be accomplished throughout the phases of change of the program, and serves to sustain the improvement process. The major contribution of the Effective Schools research to the Management of Change literature and that of Educational Administration is the discovery of this criterion ("All kids can learn") which pulls the program forward in the name of a compelling statement of the primary purpose of public schooling. Such a statement allows translation of the criterion into operations which work for all children over time and under many adverse conditions.

Until the present time, studies of school change have been confounded by the pluralistic goals of most schools in the United States,

many of which work counterproductively to each other, and inhibit the forces which can produce beneficial and lasting change. The correlates of the Effective Schools research, which name the fundamental requirements of organizational arrangements at the school site in order for school improvement to take place, make sense. The correlates lay the foundation upon which effective principals can design and build a good school.

But without the criterion of effectiveness,the correlates are merely first steps to take, climate variables to be accomplished, in order for change for anything to proceed. The proper criterion of effectiveness is needed to empower the principal and everyone working at the school site, and to give reason to the improvement effort.

EXHIBIT I

CHART OF FACTORS PRINCIPALS CONSIDER IMPORTANT DURING DIFFERENT PHASES OF THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROCESS, WITH ATTENDANT ELEMENTS, GROUPED BY MAJOR FRAMES

	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III	
Elements emphasized in the factors:	CULTURE	CLIMATE	CONSISTENCY	COHESION
PRINCIPAL'S FRAMES:				
CRITERION OF EFFECTIVENESS:	"All kids can learn" Individualized Instruction Independent Learning High expectations for staff and students communicated to all constituencies Clear academic and social goals articulated:	Safe and Orderly School ..a pleasant place for work Timely and accurate data feed-back to teachers regarding effectiveness criterion and program objectives Inter-staff communication encouraged Staff re-assignment Student re- assignment	Monitoring and Scanning System used at all times NEEDED RESOURCES OBTAINED TRUST RELATIONS ESTABLISHED	
PRINCIPAL-STAFF-STUDENT-PARENT WORKING RELATIONSHIP:	Needs of kids come first Principal symbolizes "Instructional Leader:" Symbolic Act...Draw the Chalk Line Parent communication and cooperation Community support	Buffering actions worked out: Negotiate a working consensus on how we do things Principal-teacher-student prerogatives adjusted Support mechanisms and processes worked out	Support and Buffering systems routinized	
THE SETTING OF PROFESSIONAL & SCHOOL STANDARDS: ACADEMIC AND BEHAVIORIAL CRITERIA:	RECOGNITION FOR GOOD WORK STUDENTS, STAFF, SCHOOL Locus of teaching-learning responsibility with the teacher Academic Emphasis: Basic Skills Other PRIDE IN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT: Student Responsibility attendance and punctuality...homework done well leadership Standardized scores used as indicator of average level Acceptance of student "where he/she is"	Instructional competence from Principal and others: Inservice training, teacher conferences timely and helpful Staff development program planned..implemented..ongoing IMPLEMENTING WHAT WORKS: CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES AND PUPIL PURSUITS ARE CHANGED FOR THE BETTER: GOOD CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT: PRIDE IN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT Direct Instruction: Time on Task Higher Order Dialogue Individualized Instruction Homework for sense of achievement Work for independent learning	Performance evaluation process for staff and administration working	
	Understanding the need for a Curriculum Development, Implementation and Evaluation Process:			
EQUITABLE DISCIPLINE CODE: DEVELOPED AND CONSISTENTLY ENFORCED	Behaviors tolerated/not tolerated at this school are articulated and understood by all	Planned for.....Development and Trial....Used and Adjusted....	...Institutionalized	
		SMOOTH OPERATION: Sanctions understood Standard Operating Procedures established by consensus		
		Discipline Code consistently enforced by students, parents, staff, and administration		
			Discipline code support systems routinized	

Source: "Implementing What Works: Elementary Principals and School Improvement Programs," dissertation written by Barbara O. Taylor for Ph.D. degree requirements, Northwestern University Graduate School, Evanston, IL., August, 1984.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BIBLOGRAPHY & REFERENCES

Argyris, Chris. Reasoning, Learning, and Action, Individual and Organizational(San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1982).

Argyris, Chris and Schon, Donald. Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness(San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974).

Barth, Roland S. "The Role of the Principal in School Improvement." Seminar at Kohl Teacher's Center, Wilmette, Illinois, March, 1983.

Bennis, Warren and Nanus, Burt. Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge (New York: Harper & Row, 1985).

Bidwell, Charles E. "Organizational Studies in Education," paper presented at 1985 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (memeographed).

Clark, David L. "The Context of Emerging Paradigms in Organizational Theory and Research." Paper prepared for seminar at University of Kansas, November, 1983, "Linking New Concepts to Organizations to New Paradigms of Inquiry."

Clark, David L. and Lotto, Linda, "Principals in Interracially Effective Schools," October 15, 1982 (mimeographed).

Clark, David L., Lotto, Linda S. and Astuto, Terry A. "Effective Schools and School Improvement." Educational Administration Quarterly, Summer 1984, pp. 41-68.

Dutton, Jane and Duncan, Robert. "The Creation of Momentum for Change Through the Process of Strategic Issue Diagnosis" in press: Strategic Management Journal, 1986.

Edmonds, Ronald and Fredericksen, J.R. Search for Effective Schools (Cambridge: Harvard University, Center for Urban Studies, 1978).

Gerth, H.H. and Mills, C. Wright. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology(New York: Oxford University Press, 1946) Chapter V "Science as a Vocation" p.140-2.

Glaser, Barney G. and Strauss, Anslow L. The Discovery of Grounded Theory (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967).

Huberman, A. Michael and Miles, Matthew B. Innovation Up Close(New York: Plenum Press, 1984).

Holsti, Ole R. Content Analysis for the Social Services and Humanities (Reading, Mass: Addison - Wesley, 1969).

Joyce, Bruce R., Hersh, Richard H. and McKibbin, Michael. The Structure of School Improvement(New York: Longman, 1983).

Katz & Kahn. The Social Psychology of Organizations(New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1966) pp. 16-17.

Leithwood, K.A. and Montgomery, D.J. "The Role of the Elementary School Principal in Program Improvement." Review of Educational Research, 52, No. 3 (Fall 1982) pp. 308-39.

Lipsky, Michael. Street-Level Bureaucracy(New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1980).

Marburger, Carl. One School at a Time(Columbia, Maryland: National Committee for Citizens in Education, 1985).

March, James and Simon, Herbert. Organizations(New York: John Wiley & Sons 1958).

Peterson, Kent D. "Mechanisms of Administrative Control Over Managers in Educational Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, 29 (December 1984) 573-596.

Renihan, Pat. "Organizational Theory & the Logic of the Dichotomy." Educational Administration Quarterly, 21, No. 4 (Fall 1985) pp. 121-34.

Schon, Donald A. The Reflective Practitioner(New York: Basic Books, 1983).

Simon, Herbert. "On the Concept of Organizational Goal." Administrative Science Quarterly, 9, No. 1 (June 1964).

Taylor, BAO. Implementing What Works: Elementary Principals and School Improvement Programs(Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc. 1984).

Thompson, James D. Organizations in Actions(New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967).

Weick, Karl E. The Social Psychology of Organizing(Reading, Mass: Addison Wesley Publishing Co., 1969) p. 27.

Weick, Karl E. The Social Psychology of Organizing, 2nd Ed.(Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1979).

0129P:ryk